UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,726	07/15/2003	Steven J. Smith	MNDSH-01004US0	7044

23910   7590   01/26/2007
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 CALIFORNIA STREET
14TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108

EXAMINER
JEAN GILLES, JUDE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/619,726	SMITH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jude J. Jean-Gilles	2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 November 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-65</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-65</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>01 November 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/26/03</u>

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to communication filed on 07/15/2003.

Information Disclosure Statement

1.   The references listed on the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on

08/26/2003 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449A).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

3.   Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claim 14: Claim 1 recites the steps of "*A method for permitting the*

sending of electronic mail (email), comprising: under control of a sender: accepting a

recipient identifier; providing sender information along with a petition provider identifier

to a recipient; under control of the recipient: providing the sender information to a

petition provider identified by the petition provider identifier; accepting a petition from the

petition provider; determining whether the petition is acceptable based on at least one

of: 1) a sender identity verification method; 2) user input; and 3) third party information;

and wherein if the petition is acceptable, the sender is permitted to send email to the

recipient." These steps fails to definitely recite a hardware executing the computer

software, rendering the claim as recited only an abstract idea. The claim equates

merely to a computer code or concept per se since "*determining whether the petition is acceptable*" in the context of the claimed invention are interpreted by the Examiner to represent computer code or concept, which does not have a practical application or tangible result.

   Regarding claims 2-65: Claims 2-65 are also nonstatutory. The independent claims are nonstatutory because of the reason mention for the rejection of claim 1 and the dependent claims are nonstatutory because they depend on a nonstatutory base claim.

   Appropriate correction is required. The above noticed problems are just exemplary. Applicant is required to totally check the application for error and correct the same.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1-11, 13-19, 21-31, 33-38, 50-54, 56, and 58-65** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Andivahis et al (Andivahis), Patent No. 7,146,009 B2.

Regarding **claim 1**, Andivahis discloses a method for permitting the sending of

electronic mail (email) (see figs. 5 a-b), comprising:

under control of a sender (fig. 5 a):

accepting a recipient identifier (column 4, lines 46-64);

providing sender information along with a petition provider identifier to a recipient

(column 4, lines 46-56; column5, lines 31-41; *note that the public key request*

represents the petition provider and which encloses sender's identifying information);

under control of the recipient (fig. 5 b):

providing the sender information to a petition provider identified by the petition

provider identifier (column 4, lines 46-64);

accepting a petition from the petition provider (column 4, lines 46-56; column5,

lines 31-41);

determining whether the petition is acceptable based on at least one of: 1) a sender

identity verification method; 2) user input; and 3) third party information; and wherein if

the petition is acceptable, the sender is permitted to send email to the recipient (column

16, lines 57-67, and continue in column 17, lines 1-24).

Regarding **claim 2**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 1 wherein: the sender

information can include at least one of: 1) a sender identification method; and 2) the

recipient identifier (column 4, lines 46-64).

Regarding **claim 3**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising:

providing confirmation of the determination to the sender (column 4, lines 22-37).

Regarding **claim 4**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 1 wherein: the step of accepting the recipient identifier is a result of a Web-based interaction between the recipient and the sender (column 13, lines 33-44).

Regarding **claim 5**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 1 wherein: the recipient identifier is an email address (column 4, lines 12-21; 46-56).

Regarding **claim 6**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 1 wherein: the identity verification method is one of: 1) an email header "From" address; 2) a password; 3) an Internet Protocol (IP) address; and 4) a digital signature (column 12, lines 50-67).

Regarding **claim 7**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 1 wherein: the step of determining whether a petition is acceptable utilizes at least one rule, wherein the at least one rule is evaluated against the petition (column 16, lines 57-67, and continue in column lines 1-24).

Regarding **claim 8**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising: prompting a user for a decision regarding whether or not to accept the petition.

Regarding **claim 9**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 1 wherein: the recipient

comprises a Web browser (column 13, lines 33-44).

Regarding **claim 10**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 9 wherein: the sender

information is provided to the petition provider via a Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP)

redirect sent to the Web browser.

Regarding **claim 11**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 9 wherein: the petition is

provided to a petition processor via a Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) redirect

message sent to the Web browser; and wherein the petition processor makes said

determination.

Regarding **claim 13**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 9 wherein: the petition

provider identifier and the sender information can be combined to form a Uniform

Resource Locator (URL) that the Web browser can use to access the petition provider

(column 13, lines 33-44).

Regarding **claim 14**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising:

providing the petition to a petition processor.

Regarding **claim 15**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 14 wherein: the petition

processor requires authorization credentials (column 15, lines 2-17).

Regarding **claim 16**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 1 wherein: the sender

identity verification method can be used by an email provider to verify that an email

message is from the sender.

Regarding **claim 17**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 1 wherein: the petition

provider generates the petition based on one or more rules (column 16, lines 57-67, and

continue in column lines 1-24).

Regarding **claim 18**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 17 wherein: a rule can

determine at least one of: 1) whether to generate the petition; 2) a format of the petition;

3) an identity of a petition processor; and 4) a recipient email address (column 4, lines

12-21; 46-56).

Regarding **claim 19**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 17 wherein: a rule can be

triggered based on the recipient identifier (column 4, lines 12-21; 46-56).

Regarding **claim 21**, Andivahis discloses a method for permitting the sending of

electronic mail (email), comprising:

under control of a sender (fig. 5 a):

    accepting a recipient identifier (column 4, lines 46-64);

generating a petition wherein said generation is based on the evaluation of at

least one rule that determines the format of the petition based on the recipient

identifier (column 4, lines 46-56; column5, lines 31-41);

providing the petition to a recipient(column 4, lines 46-56; column5, lines 31-41);

under control of the recipient(fig. 5 b):

accepting the petition (column 4, lines 46-56; column5, lines 31-41);

determining whether the petition is acceptable based on at least one of: 1) a

sender identity verification method; 2) user input; and 3) third party information; and

wherein if the petition is acceptable, the sender is permitted to send email to the

recipient (column 16, lines 57-67, and continue in column lines 1-24).

Regarding **claim 22**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 21, further comprising:

providing the recipient identifier to a petition provider; and accepting a petition from the

petition provider.

Regarding **claim 23**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 21 wherein: the sender

information can include at least one of: 1) a sender identification method; and 2) the

recipient identifier (column 4, lines 46-64).

Regarding **claim 24**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 22 wherein: the petition

provider and the sender are part of the same system.

Regarding **claim 25**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 21 wherein: the step of

accepting the recipient identifier is a result of a Web-based interaction between the

recipient and the sender (column 13, lines 33-44).

Regarding **claim 26**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 21 wherein: the recipient

identifier is an email address (column 4, lines 12-21; 46-56).

Regarding **claim 27**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 21 wherein: the identity

verification method is one of: 1) an email header "From" address; 2) a password; 3) an

Internet Protocol (IP) address; and 4) a digital signature (column 12, lines 50-67).

Regarding **claim 28**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 21 wherein: the step of

determining whether a petition is acceptable utilizes at least one rule, wherein the at

least one rule is evaluated against the petition (column 16, lines 57-67, and continue in

column lines 1-24).

Regarding **claim 29**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 21, further comprising:

prompting a user for a decision regarding whether or not to accept the petition (column

9, lines 1-44).

Regarding **claim 30**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 21 wherein: the recipient

comprises a Web browser (column 13, lines 33-44).

Regarding **claim 31**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 30 wherein: the petition is

provided to a petition processor via a Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) redirect sent

to the Web browser; and wherein the petition processor makes said determination

(column 13, lines 33-44).

Regarding **claim 33**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 21, further comprising:

providing the petition to a petition processor (column 4, lines 22-37).

Regarding **claim 34**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 33 wherein: the petition

processor requires authorization credentials (column 15, lines 2-17).

Regarding **claim 35**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 21 wherein: the sender

identity verification method can be used by a petition processor to verify that an email

message is from the sender.

Regarding **claim 36**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 22 wherein: the petition

provider generates the petition based on one or more rules.

Regarding **claim 37**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 36 wherein: a rule can

determine at least one of: 1) whether to generate the petition; 2) a format of the petition;

3) an identity of a petition processor; 4) a recipient email address (column 4, lines 12-

21; 46-56).

Regarding **claim 38**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 36 wherein: a rule can be triggered based on the recipient identifier.

Regarding **claim 50**, Andivahis discloses a system for permitting the sending of electronic mail (email) (fig. 4), comprising:

a sender component operable to accept a recipient identifier and generate sender information, wherein the sender information can be used to generate a petition (column 4, lines 46-64);

a petition provider component operable to generate a petition based on the sender information and at least one rule (column 4, lines 12-21; 46-56); and

wherein the petition includes a sender identity verification method which can be used to

verify the identity of the sender (column 4, lines 12-56).

Regarding **claim 51**, Andivahis discloses the system of claim 50, further comprising: a web browser operable to accept the sender information from the sender component and provide the sender information to the petition provider component (column 13, lines 33-44).

Regarding **claim 52**, Andivahis discloses the system of claim 50, further comprising: a

petition processor component operable to accept the petition and determine whether the petition is acceptable based on at least one of: 1) the sender identity verification method; 2) user input; and 3) third party information; and wherein if the petition is acceptable, the sender component is permitted to send email to a recipient associated with the recipient identifier (column 16, lines 57-67, and continue in column lines 1-24).

Regarding **claim 53**, Andivahis discloses the system of claim 52, further comprising: a web browser operable to accept the petition from the petition provider component and to provide the petition to the petition processor (column 13, lines 33-44).

Regarding **claim 54**, Andivahis discloses the system of claim 52 wherein: the petition processor component can provide a confirmation to the sender (column 4; lines 22-37).

Regarding **claim 55**, Andivahis discloses the system of claim 52 wherein: the browser can identify the petition based on a Multipurpose Internet Mail Extension (MIME) type.

Regarding **claim 56**, Andivahis discloses the system of claim 50 wherein: the sender identification verification method is one of: 1) an email header "From" address; 2) a password; 3) an Internet Protocol (IP) address; and 4) a digital signature (column 12, lines 50-67).

Regarding **claim 58**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 50 wherein: the at least

one rule can determine at least one of: 1) whether to generate the petition; 2) a format

of the petition; and 3) an identity of a petition processor.

Regarding **claim 59**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 50 wherein: the at least

one rule can be triggered based on the recipient identifier.

Regarding **claim 60**, Andivahis discloses a machine readable medium having

instructions stored thereon that when executed by a processor cause a system (fig. 4)

to:

     accept a recipient identifier(column 4, lines 46-64); provide a petition to a

recipient wherein the recipient corresponds to the recipient identifier and wherein the

petition is based on the evaluation of at least one rule; determine whether the petition is

acceptable based on at least one of: 1) a sender identity verification method; 2) user

input; and 3) third party information; and wherein if the request is acceptable, the sender

is permitted to send email to the recipient (column 16, lines 57-67, and continue in

column lines 1-24).

Regarding **claim 61**, Andivahis discloses a computer data signal embodied in a

transmission medium (fig. 5 a-b), comprising:

     a code segment including instructions to accept a recipient identifier (column 4,

lines 46-64); a code segment including instructions to provide a petition to a recipient

wherein the recipient corresponds to the recipient identifier and wherein the petition is

based on the evaluation of at least one rule (column 4, lines 46-56; column5, lines 31-

41); a code segment including instructions to determine whether the petition is

acceptable based on at least one of: 1) a sender identity verification method; 2) user

input; and 3) third party information; and wherein if the request is acceptable, the sender

is permitted to send email to the recipient (column 16, lines 57-67, and continue in

column lines 1-24).

Regarding **claim 62**, Andivahis discloses a method comprising: accepting a recipient

identifier (fig. 5 a-b), wherein the recipient identifier can be used to identify an electronic

mail (email) recipient(column 4, lines 46-64); generating a petition based on the

recipient identifier and at least one petition rule, wherein the at least one petition rule

includes at least one of: 1) a sender identification method; and 2) a recipient; and

wherein the petition can be used by a email provider to allow a recipient to receive email

from a sender (column 16, lines 57-67, and continue in column lines 1-24).

Regarding **claim 63**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 62, further comprising:

adding the sender to an email access list for the recipient.

Regarding **claim 64**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 62, further comprising:

providing the petition to a petition processor, wherein the petition processor can

determine if the petition is valid (column 9, lines 1-44)..

Regarding **claim 65**, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 62, further comprising:

determining whether the recipient is licensed to invoke petition generation (column 9,

lines 1-44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   **Claims 12,20, 32, 39, 40-49, 55, 57** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Andivahis in view of SHIRAI et al (Gilmour) U.S. Patent No.

6,154,783.

Regarding claim 40: Andivahis discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

Andivahis teaches a method for permitting a sender to provide electronic mail (email) to

a recipient (see Andivahis; figs. 5 a-b), said method comprising:

providing a recipient email address to the sender (see Andivahis; column 4, lines

12-21; 46-56);

providing a petition to the recipient, wherein the petition includes a sender

identity verification method (see Andivahis; column 12, lines 29-46);

determining whether the petition is acceptable based on authorization credentials

and at least one of: 1) the sender identity verification method; 2) user input; and 3) third

party information (see Andivahis; column 16, lines 57-67, and continue in column lines

1-24);

adding the sender to an email access list if the petition and the authorization

credentials are acceptable (see Andivahis; column 15, lines 2-17); and

However, Andivahis fails to teach a method wherein the email access list is used

to determine whether or not email from the sender is permitted to reach the recipient.

In the same field of endeavor, SHIRAI discloses an..."*When a transmission*

target file is designated, a mail tool 302 extracts users who can access the designated

file from the access list 301g, and automatically set the extracted users as destination

users. More specifically, in step S14 in FIG. 5, an attached file generation unit 301c

generates an attached file, and the mail tool 302 extracts users who can access the

designated file by referring to the access list 301g. These users are then set as the

destination of the mail text generated in step S11..." [see SHIRAI; fig. 15; par. 0116].

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated SHIRAI's teachings of using both an email access list for acceptable credentials with the teachings of Andivahis, for the purpose of improving the ability of a network "...*to provide an information processing system, an information processing apparatus, and an information processing method which reduce loads imposed on computer resources, computer network resources, and users in file transmission using electronic mail...*" as stated by SHIRAI in par. 0023. By this rationale, **claim 40** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 41**, the combination Andivahis-SHIRAI discloses the method of claim 40, further comprising: providing confirmation of the determination to the sender (see Andivahis; column 4, lines 22-37).

Regarding **claim 42**, the combination Andivahis-SHIRAI discloses the method of claim 40 wherein: the step of providing the recipient email address to the sender is a result of a Web-based interaction between the recipient and the sender (see Andivahis; column 13, lines 33-44) and (see Andivahis; column 4, lines 12-21; 46-56).

Regarding **claim 43**, the combination Andivahis-SHIRAI discloses the method of claim 40 wherein: the sender identity verification method can be used by the recipient to verify that an email message is from the sender (see Andivahis; column 9, lines 1-44).

Regarding **claim 44**, the combination Andivahis-SHIRAI discloses the method of claim 40 wherein: the identity verification method is one of: 1) an email header "From" address; 2) a password; 3) an Internet Protocol (IP) address; and 4) a digital signature (column 12, lines 50-67).

Regarding **claim 45**, the combination Andivahis-SHIRAI discloses the method of claim 40 wherein: the petition is provided to a Web browser (see Andivahis; column 13, lines 33-44).

Regarding **claim 47**, the combination Andivahis-SHIRAI discloses the method of claim 40 wherein: the step of determining whether a petition is acceptable utilizes at least one rule, wherein the at least one rule is evaluated against the petition (column 16, lines 57-67, and continue in column lines 1-24).

Regarding **claim 48**, the combination Andivahis-SHIRAI discloses the method of claim 40, further comprising: prompting a user for a decision regarding whether or not to accept the petition (column 16, lines 57-67, and continue in column lines 1-24).

Regarding **claim 49**, the combination Andivahis-SHIRAI discloses a system (see Andivahis; fig. 4) comprising:

a means for providing a recipient email address to the sender (see Andivahis; column 4, lines 12-21; 46-56);

a means for providing a petition to the recipient, wherein the petition includes a sender identity verification method (see Andivahis; column 4, lines 46-56; column5, lines 31-41);

a means for determining whether the petition is acceptable based on authorization credentials and at least one of: 1) the sender identity verification method; 2) user input; and 3) third party information (see Andivahis; column 16, lines 57-67, and continue in column lines 1-24);

a means for adding the sender to an email access list if the petition and the authorization credentials are acceptable; and

wherein the email access list is used to determine whether or not email from the sender is permitted to reach the recipient.

Regarding claims 12, the combination Andivahis-SHIRAI discloses the method of claim 9 wherein: the Web browser can identify the petition based on a Multipurpose Internet Mail Extension (MIME) type (see SHIRAI; par. 0007).

Regarding claim 20, Andivahis discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising: adding the sender to an email access list if the petition is acceptable; and wherein the email access list is used to determine whether or not email from a sender is permitted to reach the recipient (see SHIRA; par. 0116).

Regarding claims 32, 46, and 55: Claims 32, 46, and 55 are similar to claim 12 and are rejected for the same reason as claim 12 above.

Regarding **claims 39, and 57**: Claims 39, and 57 are similar to claim 20 and are rejected for the same reason as claim 20 above.

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Jude Jean-Gilles whose telephone number is (571) 272-3914. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley, can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3719.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Jude Jean-Gilles

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2143

JJG

January 16, 2007

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100